

GENERAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
Minutes – July 21, 2015

Call to Order. Chair Brill called the meeting of the General Services Committee to order at 8:00 A.M., Tuesday, July 21, 2015 in Conference Room N-1, Rock County Courthouse East.

Committee Members Present: Supervisors Brill, Brien and Zajac.

Committee Members Absent: Supervisors Heidenreich and Nash.

Staff Members Present: Rob Leu, General Services Director; Josh Smith, County Administrator; Randy Terronez and Nick Osborne, Assistants to the County Administrator.

Others Present: Supervisor Podzilni.

Approval of Agenda: Supervisor Zajac moved approval of the agenda as presented, second by Supervisor Brien. ADOPTED.

Citizen Participation. None.

Approval of Minutes. Supervisor Zajac moved approval of the minutes of July 7, 2015 as presented, second by Supervisor Brien. ADOPTED.

Transfers and Appropriations. None.

Bills/Encumbrances

Postage	\$ 886.03
General Services	15,348.53
Glen Oaks Facility Operations	559.71
Youth Services Center	718.12
Communications Center Operations	852.05
Diversion / ASC Program	591.37
Jail Capital Improvements	9,473.16
Jail/HCC Building Complex	5,792.86
HCC Building Complex	2,107.01

Pre-Approved Encumbrance Amendments None.

Supervisor Zajac moved approval of the above Bills/Encumbrances and Pre-Approved Encumbrances for the General Services Committee, second by Supervisor Brien. ADOPTED.

Update.

Courthouse Windows Project Mr. Leu handed out an update report and went over it. (Attached)

Chair Brill asked if the County would be able to get a cash settlement. Mr. Leu said he had not asked that question.

Discussion on the cost of replacing the glass in the frames, and storage of the panes of glass.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Leu to bring the costs for the different options back to the Committee.

Chair Brill said he would like to have the review of the options and the associated costs brought back to the next meeting.

Courthouse Tower Project Mr. Leu handed out an update report and went over it. (Attached)

Chair Brill asked if the project does not start until September if there would be time to have the tower down this year. Mr. Leu said he did not think this would be a problem.

Chair Brill said he would like the County Board to know what is happening on this project as he is getting many questions from County Board members. Mr. Smith suggested a short update under Communications at the next County Board meeting. Mr. Leu said he would get something written up for Chair Brill.

Supervisor Brien asked if there is an estimate on how long it will take to take down the tower. Mr. Leu said he did not know but would check with the engineer. Supervisor Brill commented that weather may start to become a problem with starting this later in the year. Mr. Leu suggested waiting until March 2016. Chair Brill said he would like it done this year.

Courthouse Security Project Mr. Leu handed out an update report and went over it. (Attached)

Mr. Smith said the Courthouse Security Committee seems to be pleased with moving forward with the first phase. Mr. Smith added this phase would cost about \$800,000 - \$900,000 and we have this amount budgeted. He asked if there is a need to bring the engineer back in to get a better handle on the costs.

Chair Brill asked Mr. Leu to get cost options for the window and tower projects for the next meeting.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Leu if he felt these projects would be able to be overlapped, to have more than one project at a time worked on. Mr. Leu said he did not see a reason each project could not be started as soon as the decisions are made. So, yes, they could be overlapped.

Supervisor Brien asked if there were any counts on how many people use each entrance, if there are peak times, and if it is mainly employees who use the back entrance. He requested estimates on the use of the back entrance. Mr. Leu said he would see if he would be able to obtain a turnstile to get some of this information.

Chair Brill asked to have the window, tower and security projects on the next agenda for discussion and to see how they are progressing.

Communications, Announcements and Information. None.

Adjournment. Supervisor Zajac moved adjournment at 8:30 A.M., second by Supervisor Brien. ADOPTED.

Respectfully submitted,

Marilyn Bondehagen
Confidential Administrative Assistant

NOT OFFICIAL UNTIL APPROVED BY COMMITTEE.

GS Committee Meeting – 7/21/15

Agenda Item #6 – Updates

A. Courthouse Windows

During the months of April and May, Jodi Timmerman from Corp Council's office corresponded with Su Pierce, our project manager from Alcoa/Kawneer on various matters. The end result is the same. They will only replace the panes of glass that have failed. They will not replace panes that have not failed, even though it is likely most will fail over time. At last count in November that number stands at 300 panes out of 900.

Despite claims that the window panes cannot be replaced from the inside, I hired Congress Glass to come in and see what it would take, and what damage would result, to replace a pane from the inside. They came June 6th and here is what occurred.

They removed the glass stops/frame pieces from the window without a problem. There was a bead of silicone between the glass and the frame which they cut out.

The glass was sealed as expected from the outside with two sided tape and urethane. Even with a special tool they could not cut the urethane.

Next they cut through the energy spacer and removed the interior pane of glass. They then cut the exterior pane into pieces to remove all the glass.

They cleaned the remaining sealant from the frame applied new tape and silicone to the exterior frame, reset the new glass, and installed the glass stops/frame pieces.

The work took two hours.

Options?

Update the current inventory of failed panes, and obtain replacement panes under the warranty. Then towards the end of the warranty, do another inventory and obtain replacement panes for the additional panes that fail. When the panes are delivered, a rented storage trailer, or storage bin would be needed.

Certainly, the option of replacing panes of glass one at a time is possible. The cost will probably run between \$400 and \$500, depending on the bids received. Possibly the time required per pane could be reduced to possibly 1 ½ hours. The panes selected could be limited to those in high profile areas. This option would be ongoing for years. The work would be very disruptive to the affected offices.

Another option might be to bid out and buy a number of full replacement units in new frames. A failed unit would be removed and a new unit installed. The old units would be sent out to have new glass installed, returned to the site and switched with another unit with failed panes. Installation could be performed from the inside, however recaulking where the frame meets the building would have to be done from the outside. This option would be ongoing for years.

The final option is total replacement of all window units. The panes of glass we obtain under the warranty would be used to supplement the total number needed. Specs and bidding would be necessary.

B. Courthouse Tower Project.

I received the technical sections of the specifications from the Engineer last Friday. Now I have to review them in detail and send off any changes that may be needed. I also have to compile the sections required by Purchasing before they can send the project out for bid. Ideally, I would like to bring the contract for the work to the County Board at a September meeting.

C. Courthouse Security Project.

Last Wednesday, I received the proposal from Mead and Hunt for the engineering design services to prepare the plans and specifications for duress, card access, door control and video (cameras). Once I review the proposal and feel everything is covered, I will write the resolution to hire the Firm for a September County Board meeting.

The scope of services is split into several phases:

Preliminary Engineering Phase

Final Engineering Phase

Bid Phase

Construction Phase

The cost for the work is \$90,000. I'm recommending a design contingency of \$10,000. Engineering and design could take 8-12 months, bidding and contract award 2 months, and construction 12- 18 months. These timelines will be reviewed once things get rolling. Mead and Hunt also submitted a proposal to convert our PDF drawings of the '55 and '99 to CAD at a cost of \$15,000.

In addition, I asked the Engineer for a proposal to design replacement of the Cat 5 tele/data cable with Cat 6. I felt we should consider this due to the fact major portions of the building will be opened up and re-wired for the security upgrades. More discussion is needed with IT and Administration before we move forward on this. The cost of these services would be \$55,000.

Besides the work outlined above, the Committee expressed the need to keep moving on the other security improvements, particularly weapons screening. I would like to begin those discussions in the September/October timeframe.

Other GS Projects – I'm currently in the thick of budget, with several major projects out for bid or underway. My plan is to update the project list for the Committee meeting September 1st.